

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In the specification, paragraph [0065] has been amended to correct the spelling of colorimetric. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-40 are requested to be cancelled without prejudice. Claims 41-57 are being added. No new matter has been added.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 41-57 are now pending in this application.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Park and Supervising Examiner Bali for the telephonic Examiner interview held on April 3, 2008 with Steve Becker (Patent Attorney) and Stephen Eisenmann (Attorney). There were no exhibits shown or demonstrations conducted. During this interview, new claims were presented and discussed in relation to U.S. Patent No. 6,058,201 (see attached Interview Agenda).

For simplicity and clarity purposes in responding to the Office Action, Applicants' remarks are primarily focused on the rejections of the independent claims (i.e. 41 and 50) outlined in the Office Action with the understanding that the dependent claims that depend from the independent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons (and other reasons) that the

independent claims are patentable. Applicants expressly reserve the right to argue the patentability of the dependent claims separately in any future proceedings.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

On page 2 of the December 10, 2007 Office Action, Claims 1, 14, 24, 30, and 38 were objected to because of various informalities. Applicants respectfully submit that these objections are moot because of the cancellation of these claims.

35 U.S.C. § 112

On pages 3-5 of the December 10, 2007 Office Action, Claims 1, 14, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are moot because of the cancellation of these claims.

35 U.S.C. § 102

On pages 5-10 of the December 10, 2007 Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 9-13, 24-26, 28-32, 34, and 37-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,058,201 (“Sikes”). Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are moot because of the cancellation of these claims.

New independent Claim 41 is supported by Figures 4 and 8-11. Claim 41 also finds support in the specifications by the disclosure of “the portion of the beam transmitted through the beamsplitter 60 to the spatial components travels through an aperture 76 (to help limit the amount of incidental light and to help to control the amount of aberrations” (paragraph [0045]) and “[i]f overlapping spectra are not desired, cutoff filters 71 that block light of the wavelengths not of interest should be inserted in the optical path before the diffraction grating” (paragraph [0043]).

New independent Claim 50 is supported by Figures 3-4 and 8-11. Claim 50 also finds support in the specification by the disclosure of “the portion of the beam transmitted through the beamsplitter 60 to the spatial components travels through an aperture 76 (to help limit the amount of incidental light and to help to control the amount of aberrations” (paragraph [0045]) and “a portion (i.e. a beam) of the acquired image is diverted by the beamsplitter 60 to a first processor” (paragraph [0040]).

Claims 41 and 50 are not anticipated by Sikes. Sikes does not disclose “the first light blocker is positioned outside of the first imaging device and between the first imaging device and the printed substrate” (Claim 41). Sikes does not disclose “a first imaging device,” “a second imaging device,” and “a lens configured to emit a first image and a second image” (Claim 50).

Since Sikes does not anticipate independent Claims 41 and 50, independent Claims 41 and 50, along with the dependent claims thereof, are patentable over Sikes.

35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 11-18 of the December 10, 2007 Office Action, Claims 2, 5, 7, 8, 14-23, 27, 33, and 35-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sikes in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,636 (“Juang”), U.S. Patent No. 6,630,995 (“Hunter”), and/or U.S. Patent No. 5,724,259 (“Seymour”). Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are moot because of the cancellation of these claims.

New independent Claims 41 and 50 are not rendered obvious by Sikes. Sikes does not teach or suggest “the first light blocker is positioned outside of the first imaging device and between the first imaging device and the printed substrate” (Claim 41). Sikes does not teach or suggest “a first imaging device,” “a second imaging device,” and “a lens configured to emit a first image and a second image” (Claim 50).

The deficiencies of Sikes are not cured by Juang, Hunter and/or Seymour. Therefore, Claims 41 and 50, along with the dependent claims thereof, are patentable over any proper combination of Sikes, Juang, Hunter and/or Seymour.

* * *

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

All arguments, representations, and/or amendments contained herein are only applicable to the present Application and should not be considered when evaluating any other patent or patent application including any patents or patent applications which claim priority to this patent Application and/or any patents or patent applications to which priority is claimed by this patent Application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of

papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned attorney or agent at the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date/April 10, 2008/_____

By/Steven C. Becker/_____

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5571
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Steven C. Becker
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,308